

Remarks

In response to the Office Action dated September 26, 2006, Applicant(s) respectfully requests reconsideration based on the above claim amendment and the following remarks. Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

103 Rejections

Claims 1-6, 9, 11-13, 16-19, 29-33, 36, 38, 39 and 42-50 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Jones (6,219,648) in view of Peregrin's MELBA as disclosed in the article "Peregrine Systems Forms Alliance with Mitsubishi Electronics America; Integrated Enterprise Applications to be Developed" and further in view of Teglovic (5,692,030). Claims 10, 14, 15, 37, 40, 41 and 53 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones in view of MELBA and Teglovic and further in view of Kidder. The Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The claims recite that the severity is a number on a scale from an initial number to a last number. As an example, the specification describes an exemplary embodiment where the scale is from 1 to 4. The Examiner has asserted that the elapsed time in Jones is equivalent to this numerical scale of severity. However, time is not a numerical scale bounded by an initial number and a last number, as elapsed time is endless. Accordingly, it is improper to equate elapsed time with severity as claimed. Neither MELBA nor Teglovic account for this deficiency of Jones. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-19, 29-33, and 36-45 are allowable over the cited combination for at least these reasons.

Additionally, the claims recite that one or more duplicate trouble tickets are flagged to associate the one or more duplicate trouble tickets, that closure of a ticket flagged as a duplicate is detected, and that the one or more duplicates that are associated with the closed ticket are also closed. These recitations are not disclosed by the cited combination of references. To the extent Jones discloses finding duplicate trouble tickets so that they may be ignored (page 5 of the most recent Office Action citing column 10, lines 4-24 of Jones), ignoring a trouble ticket is entirely different from flagging a trouble ticket and then closing the flagged duplicate once an associated ticket is closed. Jones

teaches away from the claim recitations by disclosing that a duplicate is ignored since ignoring a duplicate would result in the ticket not being closed. Claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-19, 29-33, and 36-45 are allowable over the cited combination for at least these reasons.

Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1-3, 5-6, 9-19, 29-33 and 36-45 is in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the remarks above and further request that a notice of allowability be provided.

No fees beyond a 1 month extension of time are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 25, 2007

/Jeramie J Keys/

Jeramie J. Keys

Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355
(404) 849.2093